WORK SESSION OF THE BRIGHAM CITY COUNCIL TO DISCUSS UDOT MAIN STREET PROJECT AND

SIDEWALK GENERAL PLAN OCTOBER 11, 2005 6:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Lou Ann Christensen Mayor

Jon Adams Councilmember
Holly Bell Councilmember
Alden Farr Councilmember
Bob Marabella Councilmember

ALSO PRESENT: Dixon Abbot Waste Treatment Department

Ben Boyce Director of Parks and Recreation

Mary Kate Christensen City Recorder Bret Jones City Engineer

Darin McFarland Superintendent of Street Department Tyler Pugsley Superintendent of Water Department

Dennis Sheffield Director of Finance
Mark Teuscher City Planner
Don Tingey City Administrator

Charles Mace UDOT Project Manager for Main Street Project
Tyler Yorgason Consultant for UDOT Main Street Project

EXCUSED: Reese Jensen Councilmember

Bruce Leonard Director of Public Works

Mayor Christensen excused Councilmember Jensen who was out of town, and excused Councilmember Marabella at 6:15 due to another meeting. She also excused Bruce Leonard due to recent surgery.

UDOT MAIN STREET PROJECT

Mr. Jones said the main objective of this meeting is to come up with budgetary numbers for this UDOT project. The City will be installing utilities while the asphalt is off the road. Originally the project was going to be from 1100 South to 900 North. Due to funding constraints, the project has been scaled back to 700 South to 900 North. However, there is the possibility of money coming through, so they may include 700 South to 1100 South. This discussion is based on improvement of 700 South to 900 North only.

Mr. Jones said construction work has gone up significantly, and will continue to go up. Therefore, they put in a 15% contingency in all their estimates.

Mr. Jones indicated on a map where the projects are going to be. Culinary water will be replaced from 700 South to 900 North. Sanitary sewer will be replaced from 700 South to 300 South, and from 100 North to 400 North. The six storm projects were the number one project discussed in a previous meeting regarding the possibility of bonding for storm drain projects.

The street lighting will be installed the entire length of the project.

There are some options with the culinary water replacement. One is to do a brand new 12" water line from 700 South to 900 North. This option would be \$1,212,000. Option 2 would not include 200 South to 100 North. The reason this is an option is because from 200 South to 100 North UDOT will not be replacing the asphalt, they are doing an overlay only. The City would have to pay the additional cost for asphalt. This option would be \$908,000, or a difference of \$304,000. Mr. Pugsley informed him that there have been some significant service failures in this area. They recommended Option #1.

There are three options with sanitary sewer. The first option is to replace the main line and pipe-burst the laterals to the property line. The estimated cost for this option is \$1,628,000. The second option is to replace the main line and open-cut the laterals to the back of the curb. This option would be \$643,000. Option #3 would be to replace the main only, for an estimated cost of \$344,000. They recommended Option #2 because of the concern with the Orangeburg pipe being destroyed during construction.

Mr. Jones continued that six of the storm drain projects are part of the Capital Facilities Plan projects. The total cost would be \$670,000. UDOT will participate in \$217,000 of this by contributing storm water on the road. The City's portion will be \$453,000. There is the possibility that part of the water generated by UDOT will need to be taken by the City's facilities downstream. Their portion of the water has some costs associated with it. This is estimated at an additional \$100,000.

Materials for street lighting from 700 South to 900 North will be \$218,804; installation, \$142,880; underground electrical work, \$300,200 for a total of \$661,884. UDOT will participate in approximately \$450,000 of that, which leaves the City portion of \$211,884 for decorative lighting. There is a possibility of \$40,000 additional cost to build to 1100 South. Mr. Boyce added that these numbers do not include downtown from 200 South to 100 North. This would probably be an additional \$100,000 to replace downtown. Mr. Mace said if there is significant reason why UDOT should participate in the downtown lighting, they could probably do that. Mr. Boyce said UDOT participated in the decorative lighting when the City did the street scape project. There is an agreement which stipulates all the details on it. Mr. Mace added that the \$450,000 from UDOT was originally for 1100 South to 200 South, and from 100 North to 900 North, so this number is probably high.

Councilmember Farr said Councilmember Marabella asked him to ask whether there are any plans to install fiberoptics while everything is torn up. Mayor Christensen said the City plans to do that. Mr. McFarland said it would probably be better to do it under contract. The Electric Department has agreed to install conduit for fiberoptics in new development for UTOPIA, but on a project like this it would be easier to have the contractor do it.

Mr. Sheffield explained that the Council prepared this budget over two years, because that was UDOT's original plan. In the 2005-06 budget, there is \$58,500 in the Street Department for the sidewalks; water, \$639,000; sewer, \$302,534; electric, \$250,000; nothing in the storm drain.

Mayor Christensen asked if there are any other funding sources. Brigham City is already budgeting 34% of the overall budget for infrastructure in 2005-06. This is a large amount for a small community. Mr. Mace said he is going to try and find out if there is any kind of funding sources available. There might be some way to spread it over several budgets.

Councilmember Adams said he does not like pipe-bursting. Mr. Mace said if UDOT goes onto private property, it becomes very difficult to tie down what rights they have without having a written document that states that. The federal government is really reluctant to do that. At this point, it would probably set the project back some if they go to the property line. It would be very difficult with the trees. They will probably have to dig in homeowners' front yards to get to the pipe. Pipe-bursting would probably be the best way to deal with the trees, but he was not sure their contract ability is there. It will damage their ability to get the contract out as quickly. Some of these agreements can take months. The open-cut would only go to the edge of the roadway. Councilmember Bell asked if the City would be responsible if it is connected to the Orangeburg and it collapses. Mr. Jones said technically the property owner is responsible for the whole thing. They are really getting something for free.

Mr. Boyce came forward and said sewer upgrades will be a problem with the trees. When UDOT came through over 20 years ago on South Main, the trees were sick for several years, but they came through it. However, the size of the trees on South Main are significantly smaller than North Main. There are 20 years of additional growth on North Main. UDOT has sent experts to figure out the best way to do this. However, the fact is that he expects some trees will be lost on North Main. They already tore through some of the roots putting the sprinkler upgrades in.

Councilmember Adams recommended going with the full replacement option if the payment can be spread out.

Mr. Sheffield asked when the project will start. Mr. Mace replied probably the first of March, depending on the weather. Mr. Sheffield explained that the City has committed the numbers he gave earlier for the 2005-06 budget, which covers half of the options. In four more months, or in July, the other half will be in the 2006-07 fiscal budget. Mr. Mace said there is probably a way to deal with this if the City will have all the money in two years. Mr. Sheffield will work with UDOT financing to work out funding.

Mr. Jones said there is no sewer on 700 South, so that will not be an additional cost if UDOT goes to 1100 South. Water will be about the same whether it is replaced to 700 South or continues to 1100 South. The only large difference is the street lighting.

Councilmember Bell asked what the waterlines are like from 100 North to 200 South. Mr. Pugsley said the service connections were replaced in 1993 with copper lines. There have been some corrosive soils in this area, and the City has been in the back of these businesses several times working on the service lines. The water main is cast iron and is not in the best of shape. If it is replaced it will be replaced with ductile steel. The laterals will be replaced with poly pipe with a tracer wire. Mr. Pugsley suggested using C900 instead of ductile pipe. It would save a significant amount of money to use C900. Mr. Jones said with the oil prices continually going up, C900 has gone up. Mr. Pugsley said he likes C900 just as much as ductile. It is just as easy to work with if it is bedded properly with 18" of sand. Councilmember Adams said most contractors are more experienced with ductile. Mr. Jones suggested using the ductile cost, and then discuss alternatives. C900 might be a little less. Mr. Pugsley said if it is corrosive soil, they will have to poly wrap all the ductile, C900 PVC does not have to be wrapped. This is a big labor savings.

The Council agreed to the following:

- ♦ Sanitary Sewer Option #2, open-cut to back of curb, \$643,000
- ♦ Culinary Water Option #1, complete replacement, including 200 South to 100 North, \$1,212,000
- ♦ Storm Drain will be paid for with bond
- ♦ Street lighting from 700 South to 900 North, excluding 100 North to 200 South, \$211,884 from Electric Department budget; an additional \$40,000 for 700 South to 1100 South; then budget additional needed in the 2006-07 Electric Department budget.

The Council scheduled another work session for **November 2**, **2005 at 5:30 p.m.** to discuss how to route the traffic, and other public policy issues.

SIDEWALK MASTER PLAN

Mr. Teuscher explained that staff used the City's GIS system and looked at a number of different things dealing with sidewalks. For example, existing sidewalks, the lack of sidewalks, schools, churches, parks and commercial areas. They also looked at adjacent land uses, whether it was agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, public uses or vacant property. They also looked at pedestrian accidents and developed ADA ramps. He indicated on a map where these areas are located. In the developed, residential areas there is a sharp lack of sidewalks. Robert Neville in the Street Department prioritized the sidewalks needed based on distance to schools, churches and parks.

Mr. Teuscher said if the City is going continue to grant sidewalk deferrals, there has to be a set of criteria developed that the Planning Commission can evaluate when issuing deferrals. So instead of an arbitrary decision, it will be more evaluated.

Mr. Teuscher suggested the City look at some kind of capital improvement program because there are some real deficiencies in areas that really need sidewalk. He said he is not proposing that every sidewalk be done, but as the Council does the capital improvement program, they should set aside money to install new sidewalk.

Councilmember Marabella suggested looking at the map, and if an individuals development is in a 5 or 6 priority area, there will be no deferrals. Mr. Teuscher agreed, however, the problem is that most of the 5 and 6 areas are already developed. Councilmember Marabella said most of the deferrals have been a half acre lot and they want to split it into two lots, and this makes them upset. He used the lot on 500 West as an example. It has a tall bank, and they asked for a deferral because they couldn't make any money. In this example, there is no point in installing sidewalk. However, that does not fall under this criteria because it is on 500 West. Councilmember Adams said they are trying to get the same price per lot as somewhere else. He felt that the lot price should reflect the installation of sidewalk. They could install a sidewalk by cutting it back or building a retaining wall. What the developer is really saying is that their property is not as attractive as a flat piece, which is true.

Councilmember Marabella said he understands the idea of the map and the priority areas, however, it seems that every request for deferral that comes to the Council is a unique situation. Councilmember Adams said his biggest concern is that the Council is giving too many deferrals, and they are not being tracked. They are not a deferral, they are a waiver.

Councilmember Marabella suggested using the standard that sidewalk is required on all developments, and then if someone approaches the Planning Commission requesting a deferral in priority areas 1, 2 or 3, they will be given some consideration. If the property is in priority areas 4, 5 or 6, there is no consideration given. Requests in areas 1, 2 or 3 could even be referred to Mr. McFarland and he can determine whether it needs to be deferred or not. The City wants sidewalk every time somebody developed, but if someone wants to fight it, this gives the Planning Commission some guidance. Councilmember Farr asked how the Council will handle a property that is in priority area 3 or 4, when there is no sidewalk anywhere around them. Mayor Christensen said maybe this could be part of the criteria.

Mr. Teuscher said the problem is that there is not going to be any development in most of these areas. The second issue the Council needs to address is if the City needs to make the improvements in areas where a deferral will never come in. Councilmember Bell felt the City needed to do this, because it will not happen if the City doesn't do it. Councilmember Adams agreed that some of the higher priority areas should be done by the City.

Mr. Teuscher said he and Mr. McFarland will work on a set of criteria, make adjustments to the missing sidewalk priorities, and look at vacant lots. Mr. Teuscher and Mr. McFarland will go to the Planning Commission on November 1. The Planning Commission will bring a recommendation to the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.